DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 370 869 SO 023 940

AUTHOR	Collinge, James
TITLE	Peace Education across the Curriculum: Some Perspectives from New Zealand. Peace Education Miniprints No. 52.
INSTITUTION	Lund Univ. (Sweden). Malmo School of Education.
REPORT NO	ISSN-1101-6418
PUB DATE	Nov 93
NOTE	24p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Preparedness for Peace, School of Education, Box 23501, S-200 45 Malmo, Sweden.
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Conflict Resolution; *Controversial Issues (Course Content); *Curriculum Development; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Interdisciplinary Approach; *Peace
IDENTIFIERS	Freire (Paulo); *New Zealand; *Peace Education

ABSTRACT

This paper argues that issues of peace and war and related environmental and social questions ought to form part of the curriculum of a truly democratic education system. The aim of these studies is not to indoctrinate young people into predetermined positions with respect to controversial questions, but, quite the opposite, to help them develop into independently thinking and questioning adults. An emphasis is placed on the skills students should develop in peace education, such as the principles of presenting a well-considered argument, concern for evidence and logic, and an awareness of bias. One model put forward is Paolo Freire's education for critical consciousness through the study of generative themes. Controversial issues such as those dealt with in peace education should not be limited to older students. Even quite complex issues, such as nuclear weapons, are of concern to young children and should be dealt with at a level appropriate to their development. This is true even in early childhood education, where the desire of some children to play war games could be the basis for political and social education. The second part of the paper looked at curriculum developments in New Zealand education, in which, even though there is no official support for peace education, there is scope within the new curriculum for concerned teachers to deal with peace issues. Learning peace, however, is more than just curriculum development; it is concerned with the process of education as much as with content. Contains 26 references. (DK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 370 869

U S DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A. BJERSTEDT

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PEACE EDUCATION ACROSS THE CURRICULUM: SOME PERSPECTIVES FROM NEW ZEALAND

James Collinge

Issues of peace and war and related environmental and social questions ought to form part of the curriculum of a truly democratic education system. The aim of these studies is not to indoctrinate young people into predetermined positions, but to help them develop into independently thinking and questioning adults. Controversial issues such as those we might deal with in peace education should not be limited to older students. Many of these issues are of concern to young children and should be dealt with at a level appropriate to their development.

A second part of this paper looks at some curriculum developments in New Zealand education, in which, even though there is no official support for peace education, there is scope within the new curriculum to deal with peace issues. Learning peace, however, is more than just curriculum development; it is concerned with the process of education as much as with content and all aspects of the life of the school are involved.

PEACE EDUCATION ACROSS THE CURRICULUM: SOME PERSPECTIVES FROM NEW ZEALAND

James Collinge
Faculty of Education
Victoria University of Wellington
New Zealand

Kotahi te kōhao o te ngira e kuhuna ai te miro mā, te miro pango, te miro whero.
I muri kia mau ki te aroha, ki te ture, ki te whakapono.

Through the eye of the same needle pass the white threads, the black threads, the red threads. Afterwards, hold fast to your love, the law and the faith.

Maori proverb

In all the critical attacks that have been made on peace education in schools, none seems to be more pervasive than the charge that it is not a proper discipline and therefore has no place in the school curriculum. It is sometimes viewed as just another time-wasting subject in an already overfull school programme (Cox & Scruton, 1984; Marks, 1984). However, as Hicks has pointed out, these criticisms often bear little relationship to what most teachers have been and are actually doing in schools. Peace studies is seldom proposed as a separate subject in its own right: it is almost always taught as an interdisciplinary study within existing subjects (Hicks, 1988, p. 176). The Peace Studies: Draft Guidelines, which formed the basis for much activity in peace education in New Zealand in the 1980's was very clear on the subject.

> Peace studies is not conceived as a separate subject to be added on to the present curriculum nor does it displace subjects. Rather, it is a dimension which can be readily integrated into existing subjects and has cross-curriculum implications.(Department of Education, 1988, p. 3.)

This paper explores some of the implications of this cross-curriculum view of peace studies, drawing to some extent as examples on recent curriculum and other educational developments in New Zealand. The paper proposes that any socially responsive curriculum, at all levels of schooling, must address the key, controversial issues that concern young people. Studies of peace, conflict, war, violence must take their place in, what Skilbeck has called "a reconstructed common core curriculum" which should highlight major social concerns, goals and values (Skilbeck, 1987, p. 9).

Peace Education and Controversial Issues: Some Principles

The issues of peace, and war are among some of the most crucial questions that the school in a democracy can encourage its young citizens to think seriously about. How then, should these issues be approached? This is a question that has in recent years been discussed quite frequently in the educational literature (e.g. Carrington & Troyna, 1988; Dearden, 1984; Gardner, 1984; Wellington, 1986). From this literature a number of defining characteristics of a controversial issue can be identified.

> (a) A controversial issue is one on which there is a substantial division in the community.
>
> (b) It is concerned with value judgements and cannot be settled on evidence, facts or experiment alone. In this respect the kinds of controversial issues that might be dealt with in social studies differ from most scientific controversies.
>
> (c) Controversial issues are usually regarded as important by a significant number of people, who feel strongly about them one way or the other.

When dealing with controversial issues one of the key questions which must be addressed is the role of the teacher. Some of the most lively and fruitful debates on this subject over the past twenty years arose out of the work of the Humanities Curriculum Project of the Schools Council in Britain. This project was based on the premises that controversial issues should be handled in classrooms but that discussion rather than instruction, and divergence of views rather than consensus should be aimed at. In order to achieve this aim teachers should see their roles as neutral chairpersons of the discussion with responsibility for quality and standards of learning. As

McNaughton has pointed out, this approach falls within a tradition of educational thought, from Dewey to Freire, which places emphasis on pupil autonomy, active thought, dialogue and discovery in learning (McNaughton, 1983, p.87).

It must be emphasised here that there is no suggestion that controversial matters such as peace and war should be taught only by teachers who have no strong views on the subject themselves. For one thing, such a teacher would be unlikely to inspire much enthusiasm in the students. In addition, it would be next to impossible to achieve, in that one of the characteristics of any worthwhile controversial issue is that most people do feel strongly about such questions, which is something that the students should be brought to realize. Of course many people feel that young people ought not to express firm opinions on such matters in school. As Walkling and Brannigan have noted, the tradition of education as transformation, as something that helps us transform ourselves and the world, has existed uneasily alongside an older tradition of education as serving the wishes of parents and the community. Liberally-minded teachers have always had problems in pursuing an educational ideal of individual autonomy (Walkling & Brannigan, 1986, pp. 21-23). In New Zealand, during the 1987 election campaign, Mr Jim Bolger, the then Leader of the Opposition and now Prime Minister, visited a Wellington secondary school and was strongly challenged by the students on the nuclear issue, a challenge which displeased many people in his party.

In practice, the Humanities Project always expected the teacher to be honest with the students, to tell them that for the purposes of the discussion they are adopting a position of neutrality, and why they are doing it. Nothing in the procedure is hidden and the students are thus able to criticize the teacher's performance. In his study of the neutral chairperson concept in operation in three New Zealand high schools, McNaughton found that in fact neutrality as a procedural device often withered away, to be replaced by a free discussion of all views, teacher included. This was sometimes demanded by students who were interested in the teacher's views and didn't feel in the least threatened by them. At other times, teachers might inject a biased opinion into the discussion in order to revive flagging interest (McNaughton, 1983, p. 94). A crucial element in all this would appear to be a degree of mutual trust and respect that would lead to a more co-operative teaching-learning mode.

Many people would agree, with considerable justification, that an education system can never be neutral. Possibly the most powerful advocate of

this view today is Paulo Freire. In his introduction to Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Staull summarizes the position:

> There is no such thing as a *neutral* educational process. Education either functions as an instrument which is used to facilitate the integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity to it or it becomes 'the practice of freedom', the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world. (Freire, 1972, pp. 13-14.)

The words 'critically' and 'creatively' are crucial here. There is no suggestion that the non-neutral teacher, in the Freirian sense, intends to indoctrinate. Indeed it is quite the opposite: the intention is to turn out people who can think for themselves and who are active in their dealings with the world. Freire has developed the notion of 'generative themes' which, when analyzed, unfold into many new themes, which, in their turn, call for new tasks to be fulfilled. These themes, which can form the context of an educational programme, are investigated through dialogue,

> ....providing the opportunity both to discover generative themes and to stimulate people's awareness in regard to these themes (Freire, 1972, p. 69).

Freire's idea is not completely new. It is part of a tradition going back at least to Pestalozzi, in which a central theme is used as an integrating principle, and has marked similarities to the educational theories of John Dewey and his followers, particularly the much distorted notion of the 'project method'. What Freire adds is an insistence on a critical, interactive and cooperative approach to learning, so that all the various issues arising from the generative theme are allowed to unfold. Issues of peace, war, violence in the community and family, nuclear power and nuclear weapons are powerful generative themes for young people to study, not as passive recipients of a dogma, but as active participants in a search. Freire's approach, as Rivage-Seul puts it, transcends the bounds of "technical peace education" and presents a challenge of "morally imaginative peace education" which includes not only critical analysis but also the acceptance of feelings and the exercise of compassion (Rivage-Seul, 1987).

One justification, then, for dealing with controversial issues is that they help in the development of essential skills as well as introducing students to significant questions. Students seriously examining a controversy should be

assisted to acquire such skills and attitudes as concern for evidence, questioning of sources, an understanding of logic and the principles of good argument, searching for bias, and the ability to present a considered viewpoint. In this way, many of the criticisms made by opponents of peace education who fear indoctrination can be answered. Teachers must ensure that all sides of the argument and all views are presented fairly, the predominant mode of procedure being discussion and investigation rather than instruction. They must encourage high standards of debate. Indeed, one of the aims of the teacher ought to be to bring pupils to realize the controversial nature of many of the questions they are dealing with. An explicit distinction must, however, always be drawn between peace education in schools and the public awareness activities of peace movements. The latter have particular views to get across and in a democracy it is legitimate for them to use the most effective methods they can to proselytise these views. The school, however, is not in the business of making converts to particular causes, no matter how convinced we might be of their rightness, but ought to concentrate on producing educated, thoughtful citizens who can make up their own minds on issues, with concern for such qualities as evidence, logic and force of argument.

This does not mean, though, that we must accept all opinions as being of equal worth. Hare, in his support for what he points out is often regarded as an unfashionable educational ideal, that of openmindedness, is of the view that we are not committed to a complete relativism. Other people do sincerely hold views different from our own, but

> this does not leave us divided in our minds, for we can be confident that we are right, yet prepared to change our views should it emerge that we are wrong. (Hare, 1981, p. 122.)

Possibly one of the skills students could learn when dealing with controversial issues, is a certain detachment, a suspension of judgement while we are analysing the questions. To quote Hare again:

> It is, of course true that many groups will want to impose their ideologies on others, and not hesitate to ignore, or distort, serious criticism of their views. But it might also be that the only effective way to counter this is to encourage the development of the critical values in children. (Hare, 1981, p. 125.)

So far in this paper I have argued that controversial issues, such as those we

might deal with in peace education are an important part of the school programme across the curriculum, not only because young people should deal with these crucial questions, but also because they offer valuable opportunities for students to acquire the skills necessary for them to develop into independent thinking and questioning adults. It has been my contention that to approach peace education with a concern for educational skills and attitudes as much as for content provides an answer for many critics of peace education who accuse it of bias and indoctrination, although there will always be adults who will value conformity in children above independence. One question which is often raised is the age at which these controversial issues should be dealt with. It is often argued that although it might be suitable for older teenagers to discuss nuclear questions, for example, these issues are too complex for younger children and will only frighten them.

A key influence in thinking about young children and controversial issues has been the work of Piaget who believes that young children refer mentally only to concrete situations, are incapable of logical thought and cannot think in the abstract sufficiently to discuss complex concepts until they approach their teens. In his review of the Piaget controversy, Short demonstrates the pervasive influence of Piagetian theory on teachers of younger children who show a reluctance to broach controversial issues with their pupils (Short, 1988, p. 16). He is of the opinion that Piaget has seriously underestimated children's cognitive abilities, and that this has been critical as far as the introduction of controversial issues into the primary classroom is concerned. Recent research, however, focussing on issues previously unexplored, or treated differently, shows that young children are less naive politically than has traditionally been assumed (p. 18). Support for this view comes from the research of Nicholls and Nelson whose work with elementary school students in America shows that even young children recognise the lack of social consensus on controversial topics and can make subtle distinctions between them and non-controversial topics. Young students, it appears, "are rather subtle curriculum theorists and critics of educational practices." (Nicholls and Nelson, 1992, p. 229.)

Some of the most important work on peace education for young children has been done by Carlsson-Paige and Levin (Carlsson-Paige & Levin, 1985, 1987). They, in fact, accept, to some extent, Piagetian theory, but they are also aware that issues of war and peace arise both directly and indirectly in early childhood classrooms and therefore adults have a responsibility to deal with them in appropriate ways. Adults, they believe, must be observers

and listeners, understanding children's thinking, and using opportunities to discuss war and peace issues when they come up either spontaneously as questions or in play. Teachers in early childhood classrooms need to create an environment and curriculum which can help children learn about war and peace in ways appropriate to their developmental level, and which can help children develop a sense of mastery and control (Carlsson-Paige & Levin, 1985, p. 24). One of the most difficult issues in early childhood education is the dilemma of war play. Mack refers to

> an epidemic of growing proportions: the proliferation of high-tech war toys that encourage children to simulate administering painless death to their playmates and other victims without thought or imagination. (Mack, introduction to Carlsson-Paige & Levin, 1987, p. vi).

In their research with early childhood teachers, Carlsson-Paige and Levin found that the most common response to war play was to ban it, telling the children that they were not to engage in any kind of war and weapons play, on the grounds that such play leads to the development of militaristic attitudes. This procedure, they feel, may satisfy the teachers' need to take a stand against violence, and to eliminate discipline problems that might arise from war play, but it does not adequately meet the needs of children's development, leaving the growth of political understanding to social forces outside of the classroom (Carlsson-Paige & Levin, 1987, p. 45). They advocate as the most fruitful approach that teachers accept children's desire to engage in war and weapon play, but for "teachers to become actively engaged in facilitating the play in order to help children use the play in ways that further their development and their political knowledge." (p. 48) Teachers, they argue, have a direct role in the political socialization of young children (some would no doubt say indoctrination) affecting such concepts as enemies and friends, war and peace and violence as a means of conflict resolution.

This approach asks a great deal of childhood teachers; for many it would go against everything they believe or have been taught (one early childhood educator told me that reading the book "blew her mind"). It expects teachers to assess constantly and honestly whether they are meeting children's developmental needs or their own. But the authors offer a positive message to teachers of young children, that they are not powerless in the dilemma of war toys and war play, that they can use the play positively to facilitate children's development and do much to foster non-violent, nonmilitaristic

political values and concepts.

New Zealand peace education: tradition and issues

In New Zealand in the 1980's after a period of intense activity and governmental support for peace education (Collinge, 1993), the subject surfaced as an issue in the 1987 General Election. The conservative National Party spokesperson, Ruth Richardson (now Minister of Finance), was vehemently opposed to peace education and a number of rather scurrilous pamphlets from various organisations were distributed (two of them are included at the end of this paper). The question of peace education took on all the hallmarks of a "moral panic" producing a sense of outrage (with, it must be said, the help of a conservative press) together with assertions of true values and educational standards. At the time of writing (August 1993) the Labour Party, New Zealand's main opposition party, has just issued its education policy for the General Election to be held in November. Peace studies and conflict resolution are part of the programme (New Zealand Labour Party, 1993).

> Labour will promote the development of environmental education, media studies and peace and conflict resolution programmes. (p. 12)
>
> These learning areas and skills are essential throughout compulsory schooling to ensure that students acquire the communication, problem solving and teamwork skills necessary for further learning and work. (p. 11)

It is significant, if perhaps not unexpected, that immediately the Minister of Education, Dr Lockwood Smith, focussed on this area. He was reported as saying (National Radio News, 27 July, 1993) that the Labour Party's educational policy was full of "warm fuzzies and weasel words" and would take us away from public examinations and back to peace studies and conflict resolution. It appears as though the debate of the 1980's is to be revisited.

Much of the activity in Peace Education in New Zealand schools has been the result of individual or private initiative such as the New Zealand Foundation for Peace Studies. One example is the Peace Van, which was started in 1982 by a retired school teacher, Jim Chapple, who bought an old campervan and converted it into a travelling resource centre for schools.

With minimal funding, the Peace Van is still going, touring the country, with its teacher Alyn Ware, supported by volunteers, giving lessons in peace issues, development of self-esteem, cooperation, conflict resolution skills, environmental awareness and issues concerning poverty and injustice. The Peace Van has made a significant contribution to the development of peace education in schools, not least because it has brought peace education to schools and teachers who might never have considered it before and thus has been active in breaking down some of the barriers to implementing peace education (Buckland, Jones & Duncan, 1990, p. 19).

Nevertheless, in official circles, even though there is opposition to peace education as such, some hope still remains. Currently New Zealand is undergoing substantial curriculum change and this year a new curriculum framework has been produced. This document (Ministry of Education, 1993), which will form the basis of the school curriculum at all levels is not just concerned with subject matter, but also places great emphasis on the development of essential skills, attitudes and values. Among these are the development of the ability to work in co-operative ways to achieve common goals, to demonstrate respect for the rights of all people and to develop the ability to negotiate and reach consensus. Attitudes and values which are emphasised include respect for others, tolerance, caring, compassion, non-sexism and non-racism. Within the science area there is considerable emphasis on the environment as a field of study, exploring environmental issues both local and global, present and future, which includes ethical questions and values underlying decisions about the use of resources. A section on technology includes a thorough study of the impact technology has on the environment and on the lives of people of different cultures and backgrounds. Perhaps most notably for peace education, the social sciences curriculum emphasises "global issues of public interest" in which "students will be challenged to think clearly and critically about human behaviour" (p. 14). The values which the social sciences should foster are deemed to be those of a "concern for social justice and the welfare of others, acceptance of cultural diversity, and respect for the environment" (p. 14). A curriculum framework, however, is only so many words on paper until it is interpreted by teachers in schools, but there is no doubt that this new curriculum gives the opportunity, and, indeed, can be seen to provide encouragement for teachers to develop comprehensive programmes of peace education, although they may not give it that name. Despite the absence of direct reference to peace education and conflict resolution, the curriculum does contain one passage which could provide even more

support to peace educators:

> At the same time, New Zealand is experiencing some disturbing social trends, such as an increase in the level of violent crime, an increasing number of suicides committed by young people, a high percentage of teenage pregnancies and a high level of alcohol and drug abuse.
>
> These changes have heightened awareness of the importance of education, for the individual, for the community, and for the nation at large. (p. 28)

A New Zealand teacher, wishing to engage in peace education, and seeking a justification to officialdom, need only begin from this passage, and then refer back to the Report of the Ministerial Committee of Inquiry into Violence, 1987, a comprehensive official report which dealt with aspects of violence in New Zealand society. This report, which is now largely forgotten, made a strong recommendation for the implementation of Peace Studies at all levels and for the provision of resources to make peace education a reality in schools (Ministry of Justice, 1987, p. 74). It is a matter of some regret that this recommendation has been largely ignored.

As in almost all educational endeavours in New Zealand today, a central role is given to Maori culture and values. The Curriculum Framework states that the New Zealand curriculum recognises the significance of the Treaty of Waitangi, the treaty signed in 1840 between the indigenous Maori people and the British Crown, which after more than a century of neglect, lies at the heart of much New Zealand constitutional, social and cultural life. The curriculum, the document states, "will recognise and value the unique position of Maori in New Zealand society" (p. 7). There are really two aspects to this in schools; a recognition of Maori values, process and procedures in the school system and secondly, the introduction of Maori content into the curriculum. Both, I believe, have implications for peace education.

With respect to the process of learning, the science syllabus states

> the preferred learning and communication styles of Maori students are recognised in the teaching and assessment methods used, for example cooperative learning, holistic approaches.... (Ministry of Education, 1992, p. 11).

The procedures and protocol of the Maori *marae* provide an excellent example of the way in which the skills identified in the first part of this

paper, those of critical thinking, debate, analysis, the individual skills if you like, are brought together with a concern for cooperation and consensus, the group or community skills. The *marae* is the physical centre of life of a Maori tribe *(iwi)* or subtribe *(hapu)*. Its buildings include a central meeting house, which is also used for sleeping, and in addition has eating facilities. The *marae* has both ritual significance for the people of that tribe and also functions in a practical sense as a meeting place. It is a place where issues of crucial importance are debated, and functions, ideally, according to a well-defined, traditional protocol. Debate on a *marae* is often vigorous and forthright with nothing held back. The skills of oratory are highly valued. But while all shades of personal opinion may be expressed freely, the aim is a cooperative one, to reach consensus, a freely arrived, cooperative solution to the problem at hand, no matter how long it takes. An important principle is that nothing that is said in debate on the *marae* ought to go off the *marae*, grudges ought not to be held and certainly nothing said, no matter how honest it may be, can be actionable in law. It seems to me that the model of the *marae* with its mixture of individual skills and cooperation is an admirable one when dealing with controversial issues in the classroom[1].

The second element is the content of the curriculum. Here too Maori culture provides models for peace education. Maori men have reputations as fierce warriors, aptly demonstrated in two World Wars. However, what is less well known is that there is also within Maori culture a strong tradition of peace and non violence. The most famous example is that of Parihaka. In the latter part of the 19th century, after the Land Wars of the 1860's, there was widespread confiscation of land from the Maoris, which as Riseborough points out, "created a sense of grievance among the local tribes which continues to affect relations between Maori and European to this day" (Riseborough, 1989, p. vii). The village of Parihaka in Taranaki, led by Te Whiti and Tohu, became a centre of non violent resistance to this confiscation, in a way which, in many respects, anticipates that of Gandhi, many decades later. Te Whiti was a man of peace, whose response to the confiscation of land was to send his men out unarmed, to plough it, an action which outraged the local settlers. He would not tolerate violence of any kind; if he did not cooperate with the government he certainly did not offer any active opposition, even when his men were arrested. Indeed, at times, he even shared food with the European roadmakers and surveyors, a subtle way of emphasising that they were visitors on his land. The events reached their climax on 5th November, 1881, a black day in New Zealand history, when government troops arrested both Te Whiti and Tohu, while

more than 2,000 of their people stood by peacefully. The history of Parihaka is a complex one, but the village is still today a place of peace, and the story makes an admirable and indeed inspiring subject of study in peace education in schools. There are other excellent examples as well, such as Princess Te Puea's opposition to conscription in the First World War, which again led to many arrests.

Peace education, limited to the classroom, the preparation of curriculum materials, no matter how inspiring, and discussion of global issues, while important, can never of course in itself make a full peace education. As Boulding has pointed out:

> It is now becoming clear that peace education has not resulted in *learning peace*. The longing for peace remains, but is unconnected to how people think the world really works. (Boulding, 1987, p. 317)

An important element in "learning peace" is the recognition that negotiation and conflict resolution are ubiquitous processes that go on all the time in daily life. Conflict is a fact of life, but this does not, or at least ought not, involve constant battles, but thousands of mini negotiations, in order to arrive at mutually satisfying solutions. This, says Boulding, is the "peace that already exists; the peace of the negotiated social order" (p. 318).

One of the most exciting peace education initiatives currently operating in a number of New Zealand schools is "The Cool Schools Peer Mediation Programme" which has been developed by the New Zealand Foundation for Peace Studies, in conjunction with Students and Teachers Educating for Peace (STEP) and the Peace Van. Cool Schools is a peer mediation training for use in New Zealand primary schools (ages 5-12) and involves teaching students the techniques required to act as third party mediators when two or more of their peers are caught in a conflict and need help to find a resolution. It was introduced to a few schools on a trial basis in 1991, and is currently used in over 100 schools. There has been interest in the programme expressed from Australia, Germany, Sweden and Ireland. The Cool Schools programme is too complex to go into fully here, but briefly the training is aimed at two groups, teachers and students. An education centre has been set up in Auckland to train teachers on how to implement the programme in their own classrooms. The courses, which are conducted over one-day sessions, are practical and involve teachers doing the same role play exercises as the students do in their programmes. Courses for teachers have also been held in other parts of the country. A manual has

been published which sets out in detail a recommended programme for teachers to follow when training their students in moderation techniques (New Zealand Foundation for Peace Studies, 1992). The programme involves six, 45 minute sessions which cover the essential moderation skills. The topics of the sessions are

1. Active listening.
2. Affirmations and "I" Statements (how to communicate feelings to others).
3. Recognizing Types of Responses to Conflict.
4. The Role of the Mediator.
5. The Mediation Process.
6. Handling Difficult Situations.

The students are required to keep a work book and to practise the skills outside lessons. Each session also involves cooperative games to help the children to learn to work together[2].

In her evaluation of the programme, Pasco concluded that it has the potential to entrust a new generation with problem solving skills, which may empower them to resolve their own conflicts in a constructive way, rather than resorting to formal processes which are generally seen to disempower individuals (Pasco, 1992, p. 15).

Conclusion

It has been the contention of this paper that issues of peace and war and related environmental and social questions ought to form part of the curriculum of a truly democratic education system. The aim of these studies is not to indoctrinate young people into predetermined positions with respect to controversial questions, but, quite the opposite, to help them develop into independently thinking and questioning adults. Thus the paper places an emphasis on the skills students should develop in peace education, such as the principles of presenting a well-considered argument, concern for evidence and logic, and an awareness of bias. One model put forward is Paolo Freire's education for critical consciousness through the study of generative themes. The paper has also argued that controversial issues such as those we might deal with in peace education should not be limited to older students. Even quite complex issues, such as nuclear weapons, are of concern to young children and should be dealt with at a level appropriate to their development. This is true even in early childhood education, where

the desire of some children to play war games could be the basis for political and social education .

The second part of the paper looked at some curriculum developments in New Zealand education, in which, even though there is no official support for peace education, there is scope within the new curriculum for concerned teachers to deal with peace issues. Learning peace, however, is more than just curriculum development; it is concerned with the process of education as much as with content and all aspects of the life of the school, both inside and outside the classroom are involved.

---

[1] I am grateful to Mr Bernie Kernot of the Maori Department, Victoria University of Wellington, for help with this section.

[2] Further information on the programme can be obtained from New Zealand Foundation for Peace Studies, PO Box 4110, Auckland 1, New Zealand.

References

Boulding, E. Learning peace. In: R. Väyrynen (Ed.) *The quest for peace*. London: Sage Publications, 1987. Pp. 317-329.

Buckland, J., Jones, A., & Duncan, Y. *Peace education: The Aotearoa/New Zealand way*. Auckland: STEP, 1990.

Carlsson-Paige, N. & Levin, D. *Helping young children understand peace. War and the nuclear threat*. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1985.

Carrington, B. & Troyna, B. (Ed.) *Children and controversial issues*. London: Falmer Press, 1988.

Cox, C. & Scruton, T. *Peace studies: A critical survey*. London: Alliance Publishing, 1984.

Collinge, J. Peace education in New Zealand. In: Bjerstedt, Å. *Peace education: Global perspectives*. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International, 1993. Pp. 11-18.

Dearden, R.F. Controversial issues and the curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 1981, *13*(1), 37-44.

Department of Education. *Peace studies: Draft guidelines*. 1986.

Freire, P. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972.

Gardner, P. Another look at controversial issues and the curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 1984, *16*(4), 379-385.

Hare, W. The attack on open-mindedness. *Oxford Review of Education*, 1981, *7*(2), 119-129.

Hicks, D. Peace and conflict. In: Carrington, B. & Troyna, B. (Ed.) *Children and controversial issues*. London: Falmer Press, 1988. Pp. 172-188.

Marks, J. *Peace studies in our schools: Propaganda for the defenceless*. London: Women and Families for Defence, 1984.

McNaughton, A. Testing the neutral chairman concept. In: Minogue, W.J.D. (Ed.) *Adventures in curriculum*. Wellington: George Allen and Unwin, 1983.

Ministry of Education (New Zealand). *The New Zealand curriculum framework*. Wellington: Learning Media, 1993.

Ministry of Justice (New Zealand). *Report of Ministerial Committee of Inquiry into Violence*. Wellington, 1987.

New Zealand Foundation for Peace Studies. *The Cool Schools Peer Mediation Programme*. Auckland: NZFPS, 1992.

New Zealand Labour Party. *Education: Our children. Our future*. Wellington, July 1993.

Nicholls, J. & Nelson, R. Students of controversial knowledge. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1992, *84*(2), 224-230.

Pasco, A. The Cool Schools Peer Mediation Programme. Unpublished article, 1992.

Riseborough, H. *Days of darkness: Taranaki 1878-1884*. Wellington: Allen and Unwin, 1989.

Rivage-Seul, M.K. Peace education: Imagination and the pedagogy of the oppressed. *Harvard Educational Review*, 1987, *57*(2).

Short, G. Children's grasp of controversial issues. In: Carrington, B. & Troyna, B. (Eds.) *Children and controversial issues*. London: Falmer Press, 1988. Pp. 11-28.

Skilbeck, M. Educational policies for peace. In: Connell, H. (Ed.) *Challenges for peace education*. Geelong, Victoria: World Education Fellowship, 1987. Pp. 7-10.

Walkling, P.H. & Brannigan, C. Anti-sexist/Anti-racist education: A possible dilemma. *Journal of Moral Education, 1986, 15*(1), 16-25.

Wellington, J.J. (Ed.). *Controversial issues in the curriculum*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986.

APPENDIX

EDUCATION BECOMES A POLITICAL TOOL

The present Government is using the education system for **political purposes** – to mould our children's thinking into line with Labour's goals and to establish Labour as the "natural government" of New Zealand.

"Peace Studies" is being brought into the curriculum as a key element of Labour's **political indoctrination.** It is the "Trojan Horse" which Russell Marshall has allowed the Peace Movement to stable in our schools.

It is a front for all kinds of **propaganda** – unilateral disarmament, radical feminism, liberalising of sexual attitudes, promotion of Maori sovereignty and exercises designed to change children's values.

Other new programmes such as feminism in English and History, sex education, "health" education and Trade Union education also reflect a preoccupation with the **manipulation of values** rather than a concern for knowledge. They effectively **undermine** parental authority and the family unit structured on Christian principles.

Trade Union Education is part of the Government's aim to support the unions on such a scale that their future strength cannot be undermined!.

Children are the VICTIMS!
Education as a political tool is being used to change our religion, culture, morality and political outlook through perverted education and pornographic videos.

OUR WHOLE WAY OF LIFE IS AT STAKE!

The present Government is aiding the forces whose direct aim is to change New Zealand from "a Christian democracy to a neutral state sympathetic to assimilation into the One World Socialist Order".

These policies further the aims of the Fabian Socialists, who, while opposed to the violent revolution of communism, are seeking instead to achieve complete control by way of a gradual process of "reforms".

SOCIALISM IS REALLY A WOLF IN SHEEP'S CLOTHING!

FRAN WILDE is a key factor in her party's destructive policies. Her frequent trips to Russia and her arrogant disregard for the petition against the Homosexual Law Reform Bill signed by 835,000 people does nothing to promote any confidence in her and she does not deserve your vote.

DON'T VOTE AWAY OUR FREEDOM
VOTE FOR THE CANDIDATE who will uphold our traditional Christian values.

Coalition of Concerned Citizens
PO Box 15172, Wellington

Donations.....

Information.....

Name.....

Address.....

DEAR VOTER

OUR NATION IS UNDER ATTACK

This Socialist Government and Allied Parties are trampling on our historic values and freedoms!

Is THIS the kind of Government YOU want?

ON EDUCATION

- **Labour has subverted the basic subjects: English, maths and science that you were taught with new subjects such as trade union studies, "peace" studies, health education, feminism and racism.**

- **All these sham, anti-family, anti-white, anti-New Zealand subjects are being INFUSED into old and trusted school subjects. The school's timetables will say that your children are doing maths or English, but in fact they are being indoctrinated with socialist politics through "peace" studies, and all the rest.**

- **Labour's policies expose your children to political propaganda, leaving them unemployable but life-long supporters of Labour's "natural government".**

The leaders of the teacher unions, PPTA and NZEI, have worked with Labour to destroy trusted examinations such as School Cert and U.E. so you no longer have a clear idea of how well and what the schools are teaching.

- **Labour has a 6 point programme to become THE NATURAL GOVERNMENT OF NEW ZEALAND. This includes indoctrinating your children through "peace" and trade union studies.**

SAVE EDUCATION
VOTE AGAINST LABOUR

ISSUED BY LEX REX, P.O. BOX 19628, WOOLSTON, CHRISTCHURCH
CONTRIBUTIONS TO HELP COVER COSTS ARE WELCOMED

LABOUR'S POLICY ON EDUCATION

Photo TANIA NEWMAN, the Northern Advocate

PEER PRESSURE: At Raumanga School in Whangarei, it is the pupils themselves who have responsibility for stopping conflict in the playground.

The school runs a peer mediation programme, where senior pupils act as mediators between people having problems in the playground.

Distinguished by their caps and clipboards, the 14 standard four pupils (above, led by Rosie Riggir-Cuddy, with teacher Diane Pennington and local businessman Martin Kimber) working in pairs, approach other pupils needing mediation. They introduce themselves to both parties, ask if they want mediation, and if they don't, the mediators get a teacher to sort the dispute out.

If mediation is agreed to, they move to another area and agree to the four rules: no interrupting, no name-calling or put-downs, be honest, and try to solve the problems.

The problems are then worked through till the parties come up with a solution they both agree to carry out.

The teacher in charge of the programme, Dianne Pennington said the children's training in mediation skills had started to overflow into their lives as well. "The little children idolise the mediators. They have solved a lot of the conflict in the playground."

The peer mediation programme was developed two years ago by Yvonne Duncan and two other Foundation for Peace Studies members, Marion Hancock and Alyn Ware. It was trialled by 12 Auckland schools, and has since spread to about 200 schools around the country, Duncan said. "The idea is to empower children by teaching them skills and processes — not just consequences — to change their attitudes."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"Peace Education Miniprints" are published and distributed by the R&D Group "Preparedness for Peace" (address: School of Education, Box 23501, S-200 45 Malmö, Sweden).

At present "Peace Education Miniprints" will also function as aids in the networking activities of PEC/IPRA (the Peace Education Commission of the International Peace Research Association).

ISSN 1101-6418